

POSTSCRIPT

TO THE SECOND EDITION OF

ARCHDEACON HARE'S LETTER

TO THE

DEAN OF CHICHESTER.

ON LORD JOHN RUSSELL'S LETTER TO THE CLERGY OF BEDFORD,
AND IN REPLY TO MR TROWER'S PLAIN REMARKS.

LONDON:

JOHN WILLIAM PARKER, WEST STRAND:

SOLD BY MACMILLAN, CAMBRIDGE.

1848.

POSTSCRIPT.

As I am called upon to publish a new edition of this Letter, it seems incumbent on me to take some notice of the remarks which it has elicited from various quarters. And here, if the position of the writer, as well as the priority in point of time, did not claim precedence for Lord John Russell's Letter to the Clergy of Bedford, his superiority in courtesy would. For that courtesy I am bound to render him my respectful thanks, more especially as, after the somewhat unmeasured condemnation with which I had spoken of his conduct, even though that condemnation was subsequently retracted, a sensitive or ungenerous man would have been deeply offended. But while I gratefully acknowledge his courtesy, I grieve to say that the reflexion and the experience of every succeeding day have only confirmed my original conviction, that the appointment of Dr Hampden to the Episcopate was a very unfortunate, nay, disastrous measure for our Church. The grounds of that conviction, I have already explained, are totally irrespective of his personal merits or demerits. They rest solely on the feelings with which, I was certain, that appointment would be regarded by a very large body, at least of our Clergy, on the violent repugnance, I felt assured, it would excite, on the agitation, the ferment, I knew, it would kindle. These prognostics have been most sadly

verified; and so how can I abandon the conviction which I formed when only looking forward to them? Evil as my forebodings were, the results have exceeded them. Alas too, we are very far from having seen the end of these calamities as yet: may God avert, or at least mitigate those which still seem to threaten us!

At the same time let me repeat my acknowledgement, that, as the Minister could not be in like manner familiar with the feelings of the Clergy, as he had the presumption afforded by Dr Hampden's unimpeached discharge of his professorial duties for so many years, and as he had gone beyond the usual measure of precaution to ascertain the sentiments of the Church, by informing the Primate of his intention several months beforehand, the judgement which I formed on his conduct in the first instance, was mistaken and unjust. It was not indeed formed lightly. For the Meeting of Convocation afforded me an opportunity of hearing the opinions of its members from all parts of the Province; and all concurred in reprobating the appointment, and wondering what motive could have led to it. Nor had I fallen in with any one, of whatsoever party, whether in politics or in the Church, who took a different view of the measure, as a matter of expediency and practical wisdom. Moreover it was strongly rumoured, and has since been acknowledged by Lord John Russell himself, that the Primate had sent in a remonstrance of some sort against the appointment; and as this rumour seemed to proceed from persons cognisant of the fact, I could hardly do otherwise than infer that the Minister had acted in disregard of what I have understood to be the usual practice, of consulting with the chief ecclesiastical authority in our Church before a new bishop is nominated. It was under this persuasion that I express my strong condemnation of his conduct; and when I found that this persuasion was

erroneous, I was of course bound to retract it. Mr Trower indeed, in his Remarks on my Letter (p. 18), thinks my retraction a proof that I myself can veer round still more rapidly than the theological weathercock at Oxford. But I have yet to learn that any want of stability is implied by changing one's opinion with regard to a fact, on becoming acquainted with new circumstances, which materially alter the aspect of the case, or by forming one judgement, when I conceived that a resolution had been taken without the usual preliminary consultation, and another judgement, when informed that the usual measure of consultation had not been neglected, but exceeded. To those who, like the great body of Dr Hampden's opponents, take up their judgement without regard to facts, this may seem reprehensible inconsistency. For my part, I wish that I could see more of this kind of inconsistency even in Mr Trower himself.

Still, on the grounds above stated, I must continue to deplore the appointment, because it has so miserably broken the peace of the Church, as from the first I anticipated it would do. Lord John Russell indeed replies to this objection, that "there is no use in crying Peace, when there is no peace." Now these words, in their original, scriptural, spiritual sense, are profoundly, awfully true. It is a destructive delusion to cry Peace, to those whose souls are still at enmity with God. The rebellious will must be subdued, and brought into subjection to the will of God, before there can be any real peace in the soul; and they who would persuade us that we can find peace in any other way, deceive and betray us. But it is otherwise in the relations between man and man. Here perfect peace is unattainable in this world, even on the smallest scale of a single family, much more so in a nation or a Church. In the very best condition, the seeds of discord, of strife,

of enmity, will always be latent; and if we were not to recognise the existence of any peace, until these seeds are wholly extirpated, the gates of the temple of Janus would never be shut. Such however is well known to be very far from the traditional policy of the present ministers in civil affairs. They have never said, that there is no use in crying Peace with France, when there was no peace. They did not wish, a few years back, that M. Guizot should be turned out of office, and M. Thiers appointed minister in his stead, because there was no use in preserving peace, while so many elements of irritation were fermenting. Surely the very first duty of a Government is to controul and suppress these elements, to keep them in order and bind them down, primarily by wisdom, by a sound, discreet, mild, just policy, removing all grounds of offense, as far as may be, and then, should wisdom be found unavailing, by force. Nor has any statesman been more assiduous than Lord John Russell, in inculcating that this ought to be done in the first place by wisdom and prudent conciliation, in order to avert the necessity of using force. Hence it would surely have been most unwise in a Minister, if from his position he could reasonably have foreseen the consequences of Dr Hampden's appointment, to select a person whose very name had become a kind of watchword to awaken slumbering animosities. It is too true, that there are sad elements of discord in our Church: but also, through God's mercy, there are elements of peace. Imperfect and full of evil as her condition still is, there is a zeal, there is a devotedness to the duties of the pastoral office, there is a desire after holiness, nay, in spite of all our distractions and quarrels, there is a yearning after union and unity, far beyond anything that has been seen at least within the last two centuries. And they who love Jerusalem, should not only pray for her

peace, but should also do what they can to promote it, and should refrain most watchfully from whatever is likely to disturb it.

Moreover, let me remark, it is especially the office of a Bishop to be the centre of unity, the promoter of peace, and of union for all good works, in his Diocese. Hence it has always seemed to me among the most desirable qualifications for a Bishop, that he should not be notorious as a leading member of any of the strong parties in our Church. I do not mean that he ought to be a man belonging to what is termed the *juste milieu*, whose merit consists in a knot of negations, but that he should have that expansive power of Christian wisdom and love, which will enable him to embrace all the forms of true Christian zeal and holiness under his wings, to foster them all, to encourage them all, to direct and guide them all, and to make them all unite in brotherly concord for carrying out the great work of the Gospel. To appoint a Bishop on the ground that he is strongly opposed to any party, would, it seems to me, be utterly reprehensible. Assuredly too we have a right to expect, that he, whose name, both personally and hereditarily, is so connected with the cause of Toleration, should not violate the principles of Toleration, and should studiously guard against every kind of exclusiveness, in administering the power with which he may be entrusted in our Church.

If this caution be observed, which the aptness of good men in England to be carried into indiscreet, and even offensive extremes by party-spirit, often leads them to neglect, we have great reason for thankfulness in finding a Minister openly declaring that he desires to uphold the security of the Church, by “an able and learned episcopal Bench, and a zealous and God-fearing Clergy.” This very morning I was reading an article in the last Number of the

English Review, in which it is askt (p. 446), amid a number of similar remarks, whether the Church can be "content to sit still, and to see men made Bishops merely because they have been private tutors in one great family, schoolmasters to another, college-tutors to a third, or cousins to a fourth." Now this melancholy description may in some degree represent the state of the episcopal bench in the eighteenth century, but is far from being a just picture of the appointments made during the last twenty years. Still it is very gratifying to find a Prime Minister publicly avowing that he purposes to act on a wholly different principle. At the same time, as Lord John Russell has exprest an opinion that I ought in candour to allow, that, "if such means as have been taken to ruin the reputation of Dr Hampden, are to deprive a clergyman of those distinctions, which our Church boasts of maintaining as the rewards of learning and piety, a fatal blow is struck at all profound enquiry, at all enlightened pursuit of truth, at all clerical independence;" I will take leave to observe that these words seem to me to imply an erroneous conception of the episcopal office. The error is indeed quite excusable in a layman; for it has been, and still is, sadly prevalent among the Clergy, so prevalent that even good men have seemed to think that a mitre ought to be a reward or prize to be gained by learning, yea, by piety; as though it were possible for piety to aim at any earthly prize, as though the very notion of such an aim were not destructive to it, as though it were not its own exceeding great reward. But even learning, even the highest theological eminence, it seems to me, is a poor title or qualification for the episcopate. Often indeed it is quite the reverse. For what would a mitre have been to Hooker, except a crushing weight of misery? The fundamental error however, to which I referred, is that of calling a Bishopric a reward. In

a certain sense, doubtless, it is so,—in the sense in which God rewards His servants for doing His work in a small sphere, by raising them to do it in a larger sphere, by placing him who has gained the five talents over five cities. But the error is to regard a Bishopric as a reward or prize for work already done, as an office of wealth and dignity, to which a person may mount, for the sake of enjoying rest and ease, after he has earned it by laborious exertions; whereas the true description of the office is that contained in St Paul's words: *If a man desire the office of a Bishop, he desireth a good work*: and the emphasis should be laid on the last word. Our Bishops are now aware of this; and to that *work* they are zealously devoting themselves. But the old notion is still lingering among the Laity: else we should not have had a Bishop's office called a sinecure in the last session of Parliament. Hence also it follows that the main specific qualification for a Bishop, though of course piety and a certain amount of learning are also essential, is that temper and frame of heart and mind which fit a man for exercising the office of government in the Church,—in other words, that Christian wisdom and love, of which I spoke before, that union of the wisdom of the serpent with the harmlessness of the dove, which our Lord required of His Apostles. For a Bishop ought to be appointed, not for his own good, for his own glory or profit, in return for any merits or services, but solely and entirely for the good of the Church, especially of the Diocese over which he is set: and his highest dignity is to fulfill the mission of Him who came, not to be ministered to, but to minister.

Nor, on the other hand, can I find any comfort in that view of the present agitation, which has led some to lift up triumphant peans on account of it. Thus a writer in the last number of *the Christian Remembrancer*, after speaking of the conduct of the Chapter of Hereford,

bursts out into the following rapture (p. 243): "These great struggles tell a high lesson of faith and patience.—Who could have thought that such high and enthusiastic displays of feeling, as we have lately had, could have been elicited by one dull, mischievous book? We get into fixt habits of thought and assumption,—that nothing can break through the hard system of centuries. And then a single act of duty breaks the fatal spell: the world of unrealities and sophistries and make-shifts is disenchanted; and high thoughts come into the Church's mind.—The Church's inner life comes out; and the cold mist of apathy lifts; and the bright blue heavens, and sharp mountain-peaks of progress are disclosed. Such is the might and mystery of duty and self-sacrifice." In like manner a writer in *the English Review*, though of a soberer cast of mind, says (p. 431): "We cannot but express our deep sense, our firm conviction, that the hand of God has brought to pass what we now behold.—We regard what we see as a mighty movement, which is regenerating the Church, teaching it to know its vitality and its power, uniting its scattered energies, and exorcizing the demon of distrust and discord, which had for years impeded its progress.—The Church of England, which was three months ago apparently divided, broken, and dispirited, has, by the threatened appointment of an unsound divine to the Episcopate, suddenly awakened with the strength, as it were, of a giant refresht with wine, and with a unanimity and a cordial mingling together of all sections and parties—has resisted the will of the powers that be, in the cause of violated and endangered faith." These are grand words, grand visions. Would that I could see any answering realities! But, alas, I can see little in all this ferment, except what fills me with sorrow and shame.

Had this union arisen from an enlightened, conscientious purpose to uphold the truth, it would indeed have been

worthy of high praise and thankfulness. But we know too well that men are more easily stirred by evil impulses than by good, collectively, as well as individually. For my own part I have rather been reminded of the uproar which arose when St Paul declared that he had been sent to preach to the Gentiles. And do we not read that, on occasion of the foulest crime ever committed, they *all* cried out, *Let Him be crucified*. Unanimity therefore is no criterion of right, unless it be the unanimity of intelligent and dispassionate judges. Now that the former requisite is wanting in this case, I have never seen questioned: I have never seen it pretended that a tenth of the condemners of the Bampton Lectures have read them. But what is the worth of an opinion pronounced by a person ignorant of the matter on which he is pronouncing? Is it not just zero? And how many zeros does it take to make up a single unit? This problem may be proposed to the ingenuity of those who boast so much of the numbers of Dr Hampden's opponents. Nay, the numbers themselves are greatly exaggerated. Lord John Manners, in his Letter to Lord John Russell, talks of ninety-nine hundredths of the English Clergy. Now the Archbishop of Dublin has shewn, with his usual cleverness, how easily a small number of active and noisy persons may grow to be regarded as the great majority of a body. I do not mean that the number of Clergy who have remonstrated or petitioned on this occasion, is small. But, so far as I have any means of judging, the number who have taken an active and prominent part in the agitation, is by no means large: and these have induced many to join them, some out of deference to the decree of the Oxford Convocation,—some by means of those Propositions, the fallaciousness of the main part of which I think I may assume to have been proved,—others through the persuasion

that the great body of the Bishops were averse to the appointment, and desirous of being supported by the concurrence of their Clergy. For this mode of circular argumentation has been running round and round continually. The Clergy remonstrate, because the Bishops deem Dr Hampden a heretic. The Bishops remonstrate, because the Clergy deem Dr Hampden a heretic. Meanwhile few have thought of taking the plain, honest, conscientious course of examining his writings to ascertain whether he is so. Still I am thankful to say, that, among the Clergy of my own Archdeaconry, so far as I have had any means of judging, the greater part have wisely abstained from engaging in this agitation; many of them, I conceive, from the conviction that they ought not to pass judgement without previous enquiry; while several have informed me that, having read the Bampton Lectures, they had seen the groundlessness of the charges against them. Nor do I know of any reason for supposing that the same has not been the case in other parts of England. On the contrary, I have received some satisfactory evidence that it has been; and of the various persons with whom I have conversed or corresponded on the subject, all, with one or two exceptions, who spoke of having read the Bampton Lectures with attention, have told me that the opinion they had formed was decidedly favorable to the Author. Among these have been several persons as well qualified to pronounce on such a subject as any man in England. I will only cite my dear and honoured friend Dr Whewell, who, in answer to a letter wherein I spoke of the Introduction to the Second Edition as having satisfied me that the Author's meaning and purpose had been wholly misconceived, said, "I have not seen the Introduction of which you speak; but I never could find anything in Dr Hampden, except a pious and learned man, whose

acquaintance with theological history made him take a special view of the value of certain expressions." I quote these words, because they represent the real character of the Bampton Lectures so plainly and truly, that they may be of use to any one who will sit down to study that work, with the desire of forming a correct judgement upon it. To me they were a great support and encouragement, at a time when I fancied myself almost alone in my conviction, and opposed to a host of celebrated names. Nearly the same conviction has since been exprest by the Bishop of Oxford. But Dr Whewell, in consequence of his familiarity with all the forms and modes of philosophical thought, and more especially with speculations on the influence they have exercised upon language, came at once years ago to the conclusion, with that quicksightedness which marks a master in every province of knowledge.

As a further instance of the manner in which this conclusion seems to force itself upon the mind of every candid enquirer, I will quote the following passage from an excellent Letter to the Archdeacon of Sarum, publisht by Mr Eliot, the late Archdeacon of Barbados. "When the attempt was made to nullify Dr Hampden's appointment to the Professorship of Divinity in Oxford, I happened to be in the West Indies.—The pamphlets, containing the obnoxious extracts from his Bampton Lectures, were sent to me from this country. My first impression on seeing them was unfavorable to Dr Hampden; and at the moment I considered that he deserved the censure of the University. On reading however the works from which the extracts had been taken, I discovered so much unfairness,—such a suppression of all that was favorable, with the attempt to give an undue prominency to passages which in their isolation from the context seemed unfavorable,—such perverted ingenuity in drawing inferences,

which were never contemplated by the writer, but which, notwithstanding, were exhibited to the public as his deliberate opinions, that I at once regarded Dr Hampden as a calumniated and much injured man. I have examined his Parochial Sermons, publisht in 1828, before he was appointed Divinity Professor; I have read his Inaugural and other Lectures and Sermons, publisht subsequently to his appointment; I have brought them to bear in the way of explanation, on whatever might seem to be ambiguous in his Bampton Lectures and other works which I have seen; and I can arrive at no other conclusion, than that he maintains, in full sincerity, all the doctrines of the Church of England.—In saying thus much, I am not pledged to defend every abstruse reasoning or obscure expression in his works. There can be errors in argument and illustration, which are quite consistent with orthodoxy of belief, and integrity of intention." Here we have a pattern set before us of what an upright Christian minister will do, before he condemns a brother. How many thousand zeros would it take to counterbalance the judgement here pronounced by Archdeacon Eliot!

But it is time to turn to the objections which have been made to my Letter from the opposite side. It was to be expected that the link boy in the *English Churchman* would set up a yell; and accordingly he has done so lustily, and has shewn an inclination to have another heretic-hunt, of which I am to be the object. But of him I will say nothing further, except that, while journals conducted in such a tone and spirit are sanctioned and supported by the Clergy, and are regarded, one must fear, by many as guides, it is in vain to look for peace or candour in the Church.

I must not however pass in like manner over Mr Trower, who has publisht a Pamphlet of considerable

length, entitled "Plain Remarks" on my Letter. For he has come forward with his name: he is a Rural Dean in our own Diocese, though in the other Archdeaconry: he is highly esteemed, I believe, by all his acquaintance; and I know that he is so by my dear brother Archdeacon, whom the state of his health has removed, happily it may be for him, but perhaps unhappily for us, from this scene of turbulence: and, though my own intercourse with him has been very slight, it is plain, even on the evidence of this Pamphlet, that he is an amiable, well-meaning, and, to a certain extent, a conscientious man. Why I say, *to a certain extent*, will appear anon. On the other hand he allows his zeal to carry him often beyond his tether, and speaks hastily and inconsiderately, and without sufficient knowledge, on matters requiring greater clearness and nicety and tension of thought than he is wont to apply to them.

His Pamphlet is preceded by a "Prefatory Notice" of Lord John Russell's Letter, of which I have been speaking, couched in language not altogether in accordance with the honour which we are commanded to pay to our civil superiors. In this however, though it is a point as to which zealous Churchmen too often forget the precepts of the New Testament, I am not immediately concerned. But there is one passage in this Prefatory Notice, so strongly exemplifying the habits of thought and feeling prevalent in the party by whom our Church is now agitated that I will cite it.

In p. 10, Mr Trower says: "The Minister assumes, or asserts, that 'an enlightened pursuit of truth,' and 'clerical independence,' are the qualifications for the episcopate. Is Divine Truth then still *to be discovered*? or is it not rather TO BE DEFENDED? This expression indeed may not grate on the feelings of Archdeacon Hare, who, if I

mistake not, is the joint author of a work, called ‘Guesses at Truth.’ I never read that work; but, whenever I have heard the title, I have thought it a singularly unhappy one, so far as applied by a clergyman to religious truths.” This passage will explain why I said that Mr Trower is *to a certain extent* a conscientious man. A strictly conscientious man would have refrained from indulging in a sneer at a brother clergyman,—which, when coupled with other passages in the Pamphlet, is plainly designed to imply that this brother clergyman has not a sufficient reverence for religious truths,—on the strength of the title of a work, of which his remark shews, and he himself confesses, that he knows nothing. He assumes, just as hundreds, nay, thousands, have assumed with regard to Dr Hampden, that a few words, which they look at independently of their connexion and purpose, mean something very mischievous; they put their own sense on these words; they do not take the trouble to enquire in what sense the author uses them: but the sense which they attach to the words, offends them; and so, without more ado, they condemn the writer as a heretic, or as a clergyman who “applies a singularly unhappy expression to religious truths.” Had Mr Trower looked at the book referred to,—which he might have ascribed to me without hesitation, inasmuch as my name is subjoined to the Dedication and the Preface of the later editions, though, from love for the original title-page, I would not alter it,—he would have seen that it does not consist of speculations about religious truths, as if these were a matter of doubt and guessing, though it does now and then try to follow them out into some of their consequences; but that rather, as I trust, it takes its stand upon religious truths, and that one of its main purposes is to illustrate and enforce their bearing on various questions of morals, politics, literature,

manners. Still, though Mr Trower's sneer was intended to injure, he is too simple-hearted to injure, even when he intends it. *Telum imbelles sine ictu Conjecit.* Or rather it recoils upon himself: for every intelligent reader will see at once, that he has violated the Scriptural law of not judging, and the law of conscience, which enjoins us to utter no word, least of all a word injurious to another, without a well-grounded conviction of its truth.

But further, what is the meaning of this shrinking from such an expression as "an enlightened pursuit of truth?" which Mr Trower thinks may not grate on my feelings, hardened as they are by the dreadful habit of guessing at truth, but which, he of course implies, does grate on his, and ought to grate on those of a rightminded clergyman. Every educated Englishman has at least read the first of Bacon's *Essays*, unless Mr Trower forms an exception, from having been withheld by horror at *an Essay on Truth*. In that Essay he may find some remarks which might be very useful to him, and to all such as think like him in this matter. After asking why people are not more diligent in the pursuit of Truth, Bacon says: "This same Truth is a naked and open daylight, that doth not shew the masks and mummeries and triumphs of the world half so stately and daintily as candle-lights.—A mixture of a lie doth ever add pleasure. Doth any man doubt, that, if there were taken out of men's minds vain opinions, flattering hopes, false valuations, imaginations as one would, and the like, but it would leave the minds of a number of men poor shrunken things, full of melancholy and indisposition, and unpleasing to themselves?—But howsoever these things are thus in men's depraved judgements and affections, yet Truth, which only doth judge itself, teacheth, that the enquiry of Truth, which is the love-making or wooing of it, the knowledge of Truth, which is the presence of it, and the belief of Truth, which

is the enjoying of it, is the sovereign Good of human nature." But, says Mr Trower, "is Divine Truth *to be discovered?* or is it not rather **TO BE DEFENDED?**" Yes, assuredly, it is to be defended: but it is also to be discovered: and one of the main ways of defending it is by discovering it. In fact how can we defend it, until we have discovered it? Not to the Apostles alone, but to the Church in all ages, was the promise of the Spirit given, to *guide us to the whole Truth*. For, though the Truth is one, and ever the same, it is also infinite, full of infinite riches, capable of infinite expansion, of infinite, ever-varying applications to new forms of life, to new modes of thought, capable of animating and vivifying every condition of human intelligence or feeling. Errours too are continually springing up in every age, growing like suckers from the Truth itself, as planted in an earthly soil, errours sprouting out of those dogmatical tendencies which Dr Hampden so strongly combats: and these can only be eradicated by our discovering the Truth, and separating it from them, by shewing when and where and how they diverge, and through what perverse strainings of particular truths they have gained ground. Verily it would be a kind of death-warrant to a Church, to declare that Truth is no longer to be pursued in it. Evils will indeed result from an erroneous pursuit, as from every other perverted blessing: but these can only be overcome by our persevering, with God's help, diligently and undauntedly in the pursuit, trusting to the promised aid of His Spirit, and in the assurance that here also the Divine Law will be fulfilled, that they who seek shall find. It was by hoodwinking the intellectual eye, by checking and repressing the pursuit of Truth, that the Church of Rome almost quencht the Spirit within her. We may be blinded indeed by gazing rashly at the light; but we are sure to

be blinded by living in darkness ; and even though we retained our eyesight, we could not see. By wrapping up the Truth in a napkin, we shall not preserve it, or discharge the duty which our being entrusted with it imposes upon us. We must put it out to use ; we must make more with it. The more we have, the more we ought to make, and the more we shall make ; whereas, from those who have not, from those who think they have only to keep it locked up and defended, will be taken away even that which they seem to have. When they look into their chest, they will find nothing in it but a mummy. For, though Death may be deemed a safe keeper, as he never lets anything escape from his clutches, that which he clutches moulders in his grasp. Most rightly also does Coleridge urge (*Friend*, i. p. 135) : “ The inspired writings received by Christians are distinguishable from all other books pretending to inspiration, from the scriptures of the Brahmins, and even from the Koran, in their strong and frequent recommendations of Truth. I do not here mean veracity, which cannot but be enforced in every code which appeals to the religious principle of man, but knowledge. This is not only extolled as the crown and honour of a man ; but to seek after it is again and again commanded us as one of our most sacred duties.” Butler too, in an excellent passage of *the Analogy* (p. II. c. 3), insists on the necessity of *pursuing* and *discovering* truth, in order to a right understanding of Scripture : “ The more distinct and particular knowledge of those things, the study of which the Apostle calls *going on to perfection*, and of the prophetic parts of Revelation, like many parts of natural and even civil knowledge, may require very exact thought, and careful consideration.—And as, it is owned, the whole scheme of Scripture is not yet understood, so, if it ever comes to be understood, before *the restitution of all*

things, and without miraculous interpositions, it must be in the same way as natural knowledge is come at; by the continuance and progress of learning and of liberty, *and by particular persons attending to, comparing, and pursuing intimations scattered up and down it*, which are overlookt and disregarded by the generality of the world. For this is the way in which all improvements are made, *by thoughtful men's tracing on obscure hints*, as it were, dropt us by nature accidentally, or which seem to come into our minds by chance. Nor is it at all incredible, that a book, which has been so long in the possession of mankind, *should contain many truths as yet undiscovered*.—And possibly it might be intended, that events, as they come to pass, should open and ascertain the meaning of several parts of Scripture." It may appear strange to have to vindicate the pursuit of Truth in these days; but an excess in whatsoever direction is always followed by a reaction. There are very many now to whom Bacon's above-cited description is singularly applicable, many who, having at one time been bit by the mad-dog of Rationalism, have been infected ever after with a kind of alethophobia.

These observations, though suggested by a passage not immediately connected with our subject, have a close bearing on the whole spirit which has been kindling the present agitation. But to turn from the Preface, in which I am only brought in by the way, to the Plain Remarks on my Letter: the first Remark relates merely to my style. Mr Trower complains of what he calls my "comic allusions." This is a question of taste, the discussion of which would be out of place here. I will only observe, that, as, after quoting my application (in p. 6) of the appeal from Philip drunk to Philip sober, he says, "Dr Hampden will be flattered by the illustration," he does not seem peculiarly qualified for judging even of

“comic allusions.” What meaning he may have attached to my words, it is not easy to conceive; though he would hardly have relished them more, had he understood them better.

To stumble at the threshold is always a bad omen. As Mr Trower, before he gets through half a page, has so strangely misconceived the first words he quotes from my Letter, one is led to think there must be some mist before his eyes, which will hardly clear up as he proceeds. Nor does his latter end belie his beginning: *servatur ad imum, Qualis ab incepto processerat, et sibi constat*. In the next page he picks out certain expressions that I have used, *effrontery, clamour, ignorance, dishonest and perfidious citation, and envenomed ferocity*, and complains of my “applying such terms as these to the large body of my brother clergymen, who have protested against Dr Hampden’s elevation to the Episcopate, including many names distinguisht for learning, piety, and ability.” Were it not for the mist before his eyes, he must have seen that I have done nothing of the sort. The word *effrontery* (p. 20) is applied to a particular act of a particular person. The expressions, *a dishonest extract* (p. 34), *a perfidious citation* (p. 50), it is plain on their face, refer to specific acts, and no way touch any one except the maker of the extracts. That, as so applied, they are at all too severe, I cannot see: nor do I see any good, but much evil, in mincing the language of reprobation, when such conduct is pursued. If men of eminence are involved therein, it only becomes so much the worse, worse as an example, worse, far worse, because it cannot be pleaded that they sinned out of that ignorance and confusion, which are ever sure to rise up when controversies are astir. Be it remembered too, that this most dishonest and fallacious series of Propositions, professing to be extracted from Dr

Hampden's writings, is not like the misrepresentations, resulting from the eclipse of the intellect by the passions, which are so common in all disputes,—that they were brought forward with the sanction of a body,—that, though their real character was exposed by such devout lovers of truth as Dr Arnold and Mr Hull, they were made the ground of a bitter persecution,—and that now, after more than eleven years, they have been revived, with all their falsehood still cleaving to them, for the sake of drawing our whole Church to engage in the same persecution. Is it a sin against Christian love to speak with severe condemnation of such conduct? That mawkish substitute for Christian love, which gains currency in the world, and which does not like to see people disturbed in their self-complacent dreams, has a dread of plain and strong words. But this is not according to the pattern set before us in Scripture, even by him who is especially called the Apostle of Love. With this example, I need not seek further justification in that of wise and good men in all ages; though I readily admit that, if I had applied these words, as Mr Trower accuses me of doing, to the great body of Dr Hampden's opponents, I should have been a shameless slanderer. But I have not. Nor was the expression, *envenomed ferocity* (p. 44), applied, except to "some of Dr Hampden's enemies." It was occasioned by an instance of that enmity, which, I think, fully justified it. But as it did not seem advisable to speak of that particular act, I regretted having used words, which in any indefinite application would rightly be deemed exaggerated; and I have altered them in this edition. The others I have seen no reason to soften. Nor have I left out the words *clamour* and *ignorance* in p. 23. That there has been an abundance of the former, the ears of all England bear witness. That there has been an enormous

mass of the latter,—that is to say, of ignorance with regard to the specific merits of this whole case, of persons who have taken part in the agitation without any adequate knowledge of the grounds of it, is, I conceive, undeniable. Against those who “conscientiously believe,” that is, after due pains to establish the correctness of their belief, “that Dr Hampden is a teacher of unsound opinions,” and who have not made use of any immoral artifices in propagating that belief, I have not said a word. Of course I think them mistaken, and, having been led to enter into this argument, must needs try to prove that they are so; but conscientiousness, however mistaken, I always respect. Above all, in times of party strife, if it be strict and scrupulous, one is compelled to do so, were it only for its exceeding rarity.

To Mr Trower’s next charge, of inconsistency, as displayed in my change of opinion on the conduct of the Minister, I have already replied. He then makes out a list of what he calls my “admissions,” with regard to objectionable matter to be found in Dr Hampden’s writings, and begins by quoting what I say in p. 10; where, after asking the question whether there is any heresy in them, I add: “To such a question it is not easy to reply with an absolute negative. It would be a long and laborious task to hunt out every inkling of a heresy, through every clause of every sentence, in a long, learned, and argumentative volume.” Hereupon he observes: “I note this sentence, because it seems to me to betray so great a consciousness on the part of this very unflinching champion of Dr Hampden, that heretical opinion does at least lurk in his writings. The Archdeacon seems to think this must be expected in a long, learned, and argumentative work.” Here Mr Trower misunderstands my meaning, as with his bias he perhaps naturally might. If I had had any

“consciousness that heretical opinions do lurk in Dr Hampden’s writings,” I should have acted dishonestly in speaking as I have done ; though I altogether disclaim the title of an “unflinching champion ;”—for, as I have already said, I have no personal acquaintance with him, and was rather prejudiced against his writings, when I first took them up. Still too I have no immediate concern in his opinions, from which my own on several main questions both of philosophy and theology differ very materially. In defending him I wrote solely from a desire to vindicate what appeared to me the cause of Truth and Justice, and under a sense of the duty imposed on me by my position in the Church. As to the expressions just quoted, they were intended, and, I hoped, would be understood to mean, that, desiring to weigh my words, and not to speak with more confidence than I felt justified in assuming, I could not take upon me to pronounce a general judgment with regard to a long, learned, and argumentative volume, which, as such, would require more time and thought to examine it thoroughly, in the details of all its reasonings, than was compatible with the necessity of publishing my Letter as speedily as possible, if it was to answer its purpose of helping people to discern the unreasonableness of the agitation so deplorably prevalent. For this purpose it seemed to me sufficient, if I could shew the groundlessness of the specific charges brought against Dr Hampden by his opponents : for, as these were the only pleas for the opposition to him, if they were removed, that too ought to fall to the ground. Yet Mr Trower, from his irresistible proneness to twist an opponent’s words into something suited to his purpose, soon after (p. 20) represents me as admitting, that, “if askt, Is there no heresy in Dr Hampden’s writings, it would be impossible—(my words were, *not easy*,)—to reply with an absolute

negative;" and "that, if he does not mistake my meaning, a laborious search would enable an investigator *to discover many inklings of heresy* in so long and argumentative a work." When such plain words are thus distorted, no wonder that Mr Trower can find heresy, or anything else, wherever he chooses to look for it.

The next "admission," which Mr Trower alledges, is taken from p. 20; where, after quoting a long passage from the eighth Lecture, I say, that "there is some questionable matter in it, especially about the real value of Dogmatical Theology." Shortly afterward this "admission" reappears under the shape, "that, in the Regius Professor's views of the terminology of the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, there is some questionable matter, especially as to the value of Dogmatic Theology." Now the very reason why I thus limited my words with regard to what I deemed questionable in the passage quoted, was to indicate that I did not regard that portion of it as questionable which relates to the terminology of the Creeds; and accordingly I added, that "no one acquainted with the history of Theology will controvert the statement of the origin of the definitions contained in our Creeds and Articles;" whereas from Mr Trower's representation it would seem that I had admitted the existence of questionable matter in the views of the terminology of the Creeds, which I expressly stated to be incontrovertible. It is quite impossible to discuss the manifold questions, which start up at every turn in the course of this argument: therefore I confined myself as nearly as possible to barely shewing that the charges brought against the Bampton Lectures were a most unfaithful representation of their meaning. This was all that was requisite for the immediate object. Here however I may add, that, though my own studies have led me to form a very different

estimate of the value of Dogmatical Theology, I am no way surprised that Dr Hampden should depreciate it. For it is a department in which our Church has been almost barren during the last century and a half. We have had many proofs indeed of the evils of the systematical spirit, but hardly any of its benefits. It is very easily accountable too that a person who had formed his views of philosophy and theology, as Dr Hampden so evidently did, in the school of Butler, should have come to this conclusion. I do not mean, that this is at all a necessary consequence from Butler's principles, or one that he himself drew. On the contrary that most cautious and judicious thinker is continually reminding his readers of the true nature and force and limits of his argument,—that it is merely supplementary to the arguments derived from other processes of reasoning, and that its real value is to remove objections against religion, by shewing that the difficulties complained of in this province receive a full explanation and justification from the analogous difficulties found in the natural world. But, though Butler himself is thus careful and guarded, many of his disciples have lost sight of his limitations, and have attached an exclusive value to that which in fact is merely a negative proof. Hence, through the misapplication and perversion of Butler's mode of reasoning, many errors have arisen,—some discernible in the earlier Oriel school, which issued from that of Butler, and to which Dr Hampden belonged,—others apparent in the later Oriel offset from the same school, and of which we may see manifold instances in Mr Newman's writings, and several in Mr Keble's Preface to his recent volume of Sermons. But of these I must defer speaking, as they would lead me into a long digression, and are of too great importance to be treated cursorily. With regard to Dogmatical Theology however, according to the establisht

meaning of the term, the tendency of Butler's disciples to repudiate it, from supposing that their master intended to occupy the whole realm of Theology, instead of merely fortifying a part of its outskirts against its enemies, is manifested quite as strongly in Mr Keble's Preface, as in any of Dr Hampden's writings. The former seems possessed throughout with a sort of horror of *a priori* reasoning, as though it were rationalism, and the parent of all evil. Yet without it Dogmatical Theology can have no existence; that is, as I have just said, according to the usual signification of the term. Dr Hampden indeed, at the beginning of his Lecture on the Articles, says, that "this appellation denotes rather the several formal propositions of which our theological System consists, than the whole sum of them, which is what we mean when we speak of Systematic Theology." This distinction may prevail at Oxford; but it is not recognised in the ordinary language of divines: hence it may happen that I have been misunderstood, from using the term Dogmatic Theology, in its common acceptation, as equivalent to Systematic Theology.

Here, as I have been led to speak of the relation in which Dr Hampden's philosophy stands to Butler's, let me add, that this fact entirely disproves the doubts which have so strangely been thrown on the authorship of the Bampton Lectures. An ingenious writer in *the Times*, wishing, as it would seem, to try how far the credulity of his readers would follow him, has made out a regular history, garnisht with dates and anecdotes, to prove that the Bampton Lectures were not written by Dr Hampden, but by Blanco White,—that they are "as much the products of Mr B. White's mind, as certain works penned by Xenophon and Plato are virtually the thoughts of Socrates. There is indeed (he allows) a considerable difference of style between the Lectures and Mr B. White's

publisht works, even on the same subjects." This however does not startle him ; for " they who were acquainted with that extraordinary person, will remember that he talkt and wrote very differently. He spoke with vigour and terseness, and with his eye upon his subject." How far this corresponds to the style of the Bampton Lectures, others may determine. Had this piece of conjectural history been confined to a daily newspaper, it would hardly have deserved serious notice, however great the influence of that newspaper may be. But it has been reprinted, as though it were authentic, in monthly and quarterly journals, and has found credence, as any story will, if there are a number of echoes to repeat it. Of course too its effect, if not its benevolent design, has been to breed the suspicion that the Bampton Lectures convey Blanco White's errors. As to the fact, after the conclusive contradiction it has received from the Archbishop of Dublin, who can speak with more authority than any man living on this subject, it would be worse than *actum agere*, for me, ignorant as I am of the times and persons, to say anything. But it may not be superfluous to observe, that the *Essay on the Philosophical Evidence of Christianity*, which, I believe, was Dr Hampden's first work, and was publisht in 1827, that is, four or five years anterior to the period when our fabulist surmises that he was drinking in inspiration at the feet of his Spanish Gamaliel, is written manifestly and confessedly with the view of carrying out and applying the principles of Butler's *Analogy*, and contains the germs of the chief speculations in the Bampton Lectures. They too who are at all acquainted with the writings of what was then called the Oriel School, will easily perceive that the Bampton Lectures, in their whole tone of thought, both philosophical and theological, are a genuine birth of that school, and did not need a refugee from Seville

to graft them into it. Moreover, though our feelings and opinions are sure to be modified more or less by those with whom we live familiarly, and so far Dr Hampden's may have been by his intercourse with Blanco White, there is a unity in the tone and spirit of the work, which bespeaks the unity of its author. Its learning too bespeaks original research, altogether independent of the French writers, who are asserted, on no adequate grounds, to have supplied the materials for it.

Mr Trower next tries to obtain another "admission" from what I have said in p. 39; which he represents thus: "After quoting the passage in which Dr Hampden places the Unitarian on the same footing *precisely* of earnest religious zeal, and love for the Lord Jesus Christ, on which he would place any other Christian, the Archdeacon says, 'In this passage, *as in several others, treating on the same subject* [what subject? the sense in which Unitarians are to be called Christians?], along with much important truth, there seems to me to be an admixture of error." Here, distressing as it is to find fault with every sentence, as if one were correcting a schoolboy's exercise, I must observe that Dr Hampden does not "place the Unitarian on the same footing of earnest religious zeal, and love for the Lord Jesus Christ, on which he would place any other Christian." He would have been talking sheer nonsense, if he had spoken of earnest religious zeal and a love for Christ, as the ordinary accompaniments of any form of doctrine. What he says is merely hypothetical. The hypothetical use of the participle is a very common idiom: *putting*, or *if we put*, a Unitarian on the same footing,—supposing a Unitarian to have the same religious zeal and love for Christ,—I would ask him, &c. This is very different from Mr Trower's version of the sentence, and far less paradoxical and offensive; though still, for my

own part, I cannot see how Dr Hampden could suppose a case, in which so enormous a difference of belief concerning our Lord's nature and office and relation to us should make no difference in a person's feelings towards Him; and I conceive therefore that in this passage of his Pamphlet he exprest himself hastily and inaccurately. Mr Trower's parenthetical query shews how he is ever run away with, or, to speak more correctly, held fast by a fixt notion. Instead of looking at the principles which a passage enunciates, he can see nothing but some inference which offends him. I am not aware of any other passages, where Dr Hampden speaks of the sense in which Unitarians are to be called Christians; but he speaks several times of the Facts of Christianity, as being the main objects of Christian faith, rather than the dogmas deduced from them; and to the passages on this subject was I referring, when I spoke of him as having a somewhat indistinct apprehension of the very truth he is proclaiming, namely, that the ground and centre of all Christian union is, not agreement in a system of doctrines, but the Person of the Incarnate Son of God, the Saviour and Redeemer of mankind. This too Mr Trower regards as a very important "admission." Yet how few divines have had a clear apprehension of this truth! Mr Trower's whole Pamphlet plainly shews that he has not. It was recognised indeed, as I have said, by the early Church, when the Apostles Creed was made the universal Confession. So too is it recognised by implication still, in the ordinance that this Creed should be the baptismal profession of every Christian. But the history of the Church is filled with controversies and struggles, caused by the desire of imposing institutions and forms and dogmas, as absolutely essential, and by the refusal of Christian communion to those who will not adopt them. A wisdom far above man's

has indeed directed the Church, and preserved her from enjoining these additions on all her members. Some of them too have been generally acknowledged to be variable, according to the discretion of national Churches; and others have been regarded as solely requisite for the guidance of her ministers. Still the right distinction between that which is indispensable for every Christian, and that which the authority of particular Churches is entitled to demand from their appointed teachers, for the sake of guarding the truth from dogmatical perversions, and repelling the assaults of error, has seldom been clearly understood.

As this passage is one of those most calculated to give general offense, Mr Trower returns to it in p. 41, and quotes Dr Hampden's words thus: "In religion, properly so called, few Christians, if any, [it is plain by what follows, that Dr Hampden includes Unitarians in this expression] I speak of course of pious minds, really differ." Then, after transcribing the next two sentences, he adds, with a mark of admiration: "Thus far, says the Archdeacon (!) I conceive all men of intelligent and candid minds would agree with Dr Hampden;" and hereby he plainly means to insinuate that I intended to express my agreement with Dr Hampden in holding that there is no essential difference in religious feeling between Unitarians and orthodox Christians. Whereas my very reason for stopping short where I did, was, that the preceding words, standing alone,—*thus far*, as I say,—would merely express, what has often been said without reproof, that, in spite of the differences and divisions by which the Church of Christ has been so wofully torn, there has ever been an essential agreement and unity among all truly earnest and pious men, such, for instance, as Augustin, and Fenelon, and Pascal, and Hooker, and Leighton, and

Melanchthon, and Baxter, and Howe, and Spener, and Zinzendorf. Why will not Mr Trower take a little pains to consider, whether the words he is examining will not admit of an innocent meaning, before he puts an offensive one upon them? I had expressly drawn a distinction between the former part of the paragraph, with which, if it stood alone, most good men, I imagined, would agree, and the latter portion, which treats of the extreme case of the Unitarians.

Moreover, I cannot but think, that there is a great deal of hypocrisy, unconscious indeed in many, and self-deceiving, in the clamour against Dr Hampden for granting the name of Christians to Unitarians. I myself indeed have always concurred with Coleridge and Arnold in thinking that it could not be appropriately applied to them, as a body; though individual members of that body may have many Christian graces. Dr Hampden too says, in his Letter to Lord John Russell: "If on any occasion I have ventured to call Unitarians Christians, surely this must be understood in the wide charitable sense of the term; not in that strict sense in which it belongs to a believer in the Divinity and blessed Atonement of our Lord; but in a sense not unlike that in which it is used in our Liturgy, when we pray for *all who profess and call themselves Christians*, that they may be led into the way of truth." Surely too he is not the only person in our days, who uses the name in this enlarged sense. For what is the main argument urged by those who oppose the admission of Jews into the Legislature? but that the Legislature would thereby cease to be a Christian body. In the force of this argument I entirely agree; and so, I am happy to find, does Mr Trower, who, in his Letter to Lord John Russell, makes this his main stay: "From the day (he says) on which that measure may be adopted, the character

of England as a Christian nation, governed by a Christian Legislature, and bearing on her front the cross of Christ, as her hope and glory, will be among things that have past away." And again, after complaining of the admission of Romanists, he adds: "As yet however we profess, as a nation, the truth of Christianity.—Our legislators have at least been required to profess the faith of a Christian." Consequently there must plainly be a sense in which Unitarians may be spoken of as Christians; a sense in which they are allowed by Parliament to make a declaration *on the faith of a Christian*. Let us beware then of condemning another for using a word in a meaning, which we ourselves attach to it, when we can build an argument upon it in favour of our cause.

The last "admission," which Mr Trower claims on the authority of my Letter, is taken from p 57, where, he says, "the Archdeacon appears to admit that Dr Hampden's doctrine on original sin is defective, though he is pleased to say, the point in dispute belongs more to the philosophical than to the religious side of theology." In the next page he repeats, that, "in excuse for Dr Hampden's statements on original sin, it should be borne in mind, in Archdeacon Hare's opinion, that the point in dispute, relates to the philosophical rather than the religious side of theology." Here we have another instance of that deplorable want of precision, which totally unfits Mr Trower for controversial argument. The reader of these two passages must needs suppose that I had said, that *original sin* is a question belonging more to the philosophical than to the religious side of theology; whereas the point under discussion was, not the fact of original sin, but, as I distinctly stated, *the mode in which sin is transmitted*. This then is the question which, I said, belongs rather to the philosophical than to the religious side of theology. Nor

had I said a word as to whether Dr Hampden's doctrine on the subject is or is not defective.

Such is the real force of the "admissions," on the strength of which Mr Trower thinks I ought to have hesitated, before I commended the Bampton Lectures as learned and thoughtful, and favorably distinguished by their philosophical candour and sobriety. Is any of my "admissions" then inconsistent with those merits? or would it be so, even according to Mr Trower's estimate of them? Not a whit. But this is one of the miserable curses of party-spirit, that it leads us to judge of books, not by their intrinsic merits or demerits, but solely by their agreement with our own opinions. If we agree with them, we pronounce them good, however silly or extravagant they may be. If they differ from us, we are ready to call Plato a driveler, and Aristotle a blockhead. Thus we measure all the might and richness of the intellect, under its various manifestations, by the petty standard of our own narrow, dwarfish understandings, rendered rickety, it may also be, by the swathing bands in which they have been wrapt up.

According to Mr Trower however, these admissions "involve charges against Dr Hampden as grave as, or even more grave, because more specific, than are implied in the censure past upon him by the University of Oxford:" and since I have made these admissions, he thinks that Dr Hampden may well exclaim, *Save me from my friends!* Be it so: as I only came forward in behalf of Truth and Justice, no personal verdict will disturb me. In the previous words however Mr Trower has toucht on one of the points which prove the worthlessness of the censure past by the Oxford Convocation,—its being a vague, general declaration of a want of confidence, without any specific charge. In what court of justice would such a procedure be tolerated? though precedents for it might

doubtless be found in the acts of the Athenian mob, and of the French National Convention. Mr Trower's attempt to vindicate the authority of that decree is not very successful. Indeed he himself admits that the Convocation "is not a fitting tribunal to pronounce finally and judicially on theological doctrines." But he thinks that it has a certain right, arising from the right of Universities, which possess a faculty of Theology, to determine theological questions, and to censure theological propositions. This right however in the old Universities properly belonged to the Theological Faculty, not to the whole body of the University. The Theological Faculty were especially qualified to pronounce on such questions; and so their verdict, when given judicially, that is, after due enquiry and consideration, was held to be authoritative. But what qualifications have the great bulk of the Convocation? the country gentlemen, the lawyers, the physicians, the zeroes among the clergy, who, we may reasonably believe, formed nine tenths of the majority. Hence we see the real value of an argument, which has been urged, and has been highly applauded. In reply to the declaration that the Crown could not allow its supremacy to be controlled by a decree of the Convocation, it has been contended that the supremacy would have been controlled by a judgement of the Court of Queen's Bench; and this has been extolled as a triumphant answer to "transparent sophistry." Yet surely the sophistry,—which ought to have been transparent, if anything were so, whereby one hopes to trip up an adversary, even for a passing moment,—lies in the answer. For if the Crown were controlled by a judgement of a Court of Law, it would be controlled by its own act, the judge on the bench being invested with the majesty of royalty; and, according to the idea of the Constitution, the Crown cannot contradict itself. But the Convocation

in such a matter has no more lawful authority, than any other self-constituted tribunal, no more than a decision of the Common Council in Guildhall, scarcely more than a vote of the Carlton or Reform Club. Indeed, in trying to get over the objection, that the members of Convocation who condemned the Bampton Lectures had not read them, Mr Trower has only to plead, that, before the measure was submitted to Convocation, it had been adopted by the Board of Heads of Houses, who, we may presume, had ; whose initiative sanction however can never be accounted equivalent to a formal judgement, even if they constituted a legal tribunal ; and further, that they had been read by the members of the Corpus Committee, who “ were all of them men of the highest personal character,” and “ united in a remarkable manner in the propriety and fairness of the extracts which they publisht to the world.” Hence he maintains that “ there was sufficient ground for the confidence which was generally conceded to them ;” that, “ in a case of this kind, young men who are entrusted with a vote are fully justified in exercising their privilege in deference to the University authorities, and the elder Clergy in whom they confide ;” and that “ this deference to authority, in the case of many men of moderate ability and acquirement, is more becoming, than to stand aloof from some great cause, the full bearings of which they are perhaps unable to estimate. That this principle (he says) *must* operate in the resolutions of such a body as the Convocation of Oxford, is self-evident.” But what is all this, except to say that the Convocation is totally unfit to exercise any judicial authority ? and that the votes of its members were so many zeroes tacked on to the opinions of the Corpus Committee, whose exemplary fairness in selecting their extracts must now become proverbial. With their personal character I have no concern. If it was eminent, their conduct is only a

more awful proof how gifts and graces are withered and blighted by the blasts of party-spirit.

On these grounds I cannot regard a censure by such a body, so disqualified, first by its constitution, and then by the general ignorance of the facts on which it was pronouncing, as “a bar to the elevation of him who has incurred it to the office of a Bishop.” Nor can I accede to the notion exprest in George the Third’s saying, which Mr Trower quotes, after the Bishop of Exeter, that “a Bishop should have nothing to retract.” There is indeed a kind of recantation,—when a person abjures opinions which he has long held and maintained, and comes forward busily proclaiming opinions which he had previously condemned and denounced, for the purpose of gaining a mitre,—which rightfully renders a man an object of loathing. If Dr Hampden had recanted now, with this purpose in view, his merited portion would have been contempt; for he would have been guilty of the sin, which renders the name of apostate infamous above all names, of bartering his conscience for lucre. It was natural enough that George the Third, ignorant as he was of the difficulties and snares which beset the path of theological speculation, should think that a divine has nothing to do, save to stick fast to his Catechism from childhood to old age. I say not this disparagingly: it is a blessed thing when a man, in the maturity of his intellect, can feel the assurance, which Luther so beautifully expresses, that he has the sum of all truth in the simple lessons of his boyhood. But many are apt to wander. Those who really love truth, and do not take up their opinions on credit, as a mere matter of course, or for the sake of getting on in the world, will often stray into devious paths, before they are led into the right one. Nor is it consistent with the whole

spirit of Christianity, of Him who came, not to call the righteous, but sinners, into His kingdom, to enact an exclusion against those who may have fallen into erroneous opinions. On the contrary, it has often been seen that a convert becomes one of the ablest and most zealous preachers of the truth, as was evinced above all by St Paul : and it may be deemed a sufficient answer to that shallow apophthegm, to observe that it would have shut out Augustin from the Episcopate.

The fairness of the Propositions extracted from the Bampton Lectures, I should have thought, might be regarded as placed beyond a doubt. But, as Mr Trower can see nothing except evil in Dr Hampden's words and mine, he is equally clear-sighted in the writings of those who agree with him. "There is nothing (he says) he would more wish, than that any one who suspects the fairness of the extracts, should turn to the volume from which they are taken." Here for once we are agreed. This is just what I called upon my brethren to do, that they might not join in an ignorant clamour. Nay, this is just what I did myself; and the results of my enquiry are set forth in my Letter. This is just what Archdeacon Eliot did, whose conclusion coincided exactly with mine. This is just what the Bishop of Oxford has done; and he also has come to the same conclusion. This is just what Dr Arnold and Mr Hull did in 1836; and their conclusion again was the same. So has it been with many more, some of whom have declared their opinion in print, many of whom have expressed it to me privately. Nor have I yet met with any one who has come forward with his name, differing from us, except Mr Trower. His complaint however of the Extracts is, that "they fail of conveying to the mind an adequate impression of the insidious and fatal character of Dr Hampden's teaching *as a whole*." This is

the safest ground for him to take: we know what *latet in generalibus*. As a whole, one may condemn any book, or any man. But this is not the manner in which Justice weighs guilt and innocence. Her scales are goldsmith's scales. She loves precision, definiteness, exactness, and cannot tolerate vagueness. She dwells in the serene sky, and abhors every mist. After the manner in which we have seen Mr Trower misunderstanding the plainest, simplest words, we may guess what he would make of a book, of which he had conceived an unfavorable impression, judging it *as a whole*.

As to the argument, that the discussions and tone of the Bampton Lectures are ill fitted for sermons before a mixt congregation, for my own part, I am not unwilling to assent to it. But it should not be allowed to bear with any peculiar force against Dr Hampden. For, though my acquaintance with the series of those Lectures is not extensive, I could name several, among others, those of the revered Bishop Heber, which in like manner treat on subjects of recondite theological erudition and subtilty. This too, I have fancied, was regarded as, to a certain extent, the special purpose of those Lectures; for which reason they are called Lectures, and not Sermons. This ought to be taken into account, when persons complain of the want of reverence in their tone. For the tone of theological disquisitions is necessarily different from that of homiletic discourses. It should be remembered too that a considerable change in this respect has taken place since the year 1832.

Mr Trower next proceeds to examine my examination of the Propositions. Here I cannot perceive that he has shaken the slightest of my arguments, or detected the minutest inaccuracy: if he had, I would gladly have acknowledged it. Still I feel it to be of such importance for

the peace of the Church, to make this matter as clear as possible, that, before I conclude, I will run over his objections.

The first two Propositions, he admits, are "capable of a *honesta interpretatio*. Dialectical science must be resorted to where accurate statements are required of some mysterious doctrine; and in the immediate context it is possible that Dr Hampden may mean no more than this." Why then not give him the benefit of this *honesta interpretatio*? Surely the charity, that *thinketh no evil*, would. Nay, even a court of human justice adopts the more merciful interpretation, when any words or act admit of more than one. This practice however has always been rejected by the *odium theologicum*, which magnifies and blackens every dubious speck, and whereby even amiable persons have often been grievously warped. "Statements, (Mr Trower says,) which are capable of an innocent meaning, may become highly suspicious, when coupled with other statements of the same author:" and in proof of this he quotes a long passage forty pages off. Well then! at all events the indictment ought to be grounded on those other statements, and not on these, which, taken by themselves, may be, and are, perfectly innocent. At all events these two Propositions are to be thrown away as mere surplusage, stuff in to swell out the list of offenses. But let us look what there is so bad in this other passage, the poison of which is to infect what had been said forty pages before. "The Truth itself (Dr Hampden writes, p. 146) of the Trinitarian doctrine emerges from these mists of human speculation, like the bold, naked land, on which an atmosphere of fog has for a while rested, and then been disperst." No one can be more convinced than I am, that there is a real mystery of God revealed in the Christian dispensation, and that no

scheme of Unitarianism can solve the whole of the phenomena which Scripture records. But I am also as fully sensible that there is a mystery attacht to the subject, which is not a mystery of God." Here Mr Trower asks, "Where does Dr Hampden mean? In the Creeds and Articles of the Church? I really know no other meaning of this expression." Yet, if he had lookt at the very next sentence, he would have found a different one. This is another instance of that fixt notion, which, so to say, impales him, and will not let him go. He has made up his mind that Dr Hampden has set his heart on impugning the Creeds and Articles of the Church; and so he is convinced that this must needs be his covert meaning throughout, although he is unable to produce a single passage in which Dr Hampden does so openly, and though, as I have shewn, he has repeatedly declared his belief in those Creeds and Articles. In the present instance the passage which follows, and which Mr Trower cites, gives Dr Hampden's own explanation of his meaning. "Take for instance (he says), the notion of the Divine Unity. We are apt to conceive that the Unity must be understood numerically, that we may reason from the notion of Unity to the properties of the Divine Being. But is this a just notion of the Unity of God? Is it not rather a bare fact, a limit of speculation, instead of a point of outset?—When Moses called upon the people, *Hear, O Israel, the Lord Our God is one Lord*, was it not a declaration that Jehovah is not that host of Heaven,—that multiplicity of the objects of Divine worship, which heathen idolatry has enshrined, but the God in Heaven, and in the earth, and in the sea?—Surely the revelation of the Divine Unity was not meant to convey to Israel any speculative notion of the oneness of the Deity, but *practically* to influence their minds in regard to the superstitions from which they had been brought

out. It was no other than the command, *Thou shalt have no other Gods but Me*. Now were this view of the revelation of the Divine Unity strictly maintained, would it not greatly abate the repugnance often felt at the admission of a Trinity in Unity? We should profess that we only knew God as the exclusive object of Divine Worship, and should acknowledge that it is quite irrelevant to our scheme of religion, either to demonstrate or to refute any conclusion from the nature of Unity, concerning any further revelation of the Divine Being. To deny a Trinity would then be felt the same as to assert, that, because Polytheism is false, therefore no new manifestation of God, not resulting from the negation of Polytheism, can be true."

Now "in this most extraordinary passage, (Mr Trower says,) Dr Hampden declares that, when Moses solemnly taught the Children of Israel *the Lord our God is one Lord*, the Holy Ghost did not intend to communicate by his lips any revelation concerning the Supreme Being himself." Here we have the same vagueness and inexactness, which is so characteristic of Mr Trower. Dr Hampden says that this revelation of the Divine Unity was not meant "*to convey any speculative notion of the oneness of the Deity.*" Mr Trower afterward acknowledges, in p. 57, that he does not "pretend to understand all the subtilties of scholastic speculations." This confession is candid, and thoroughly true: only it would have become him, under this consciousness, to refrain from discussions which cannot be carried on without a considerable understanding of such subtilties. When Dr Hampden's assertion, that the Scriptural declaration is not meant *to convey any speculative notion of the oneness of the Deity*, is expanded into an assertion that it is not meant *to convey any revelation concerning the Supreme Being*, it is no wonder that all sorts of monsters may be started in every page.

Of course Mr Trower finds out that this passage cannot be reconciled with the Athanasian and other Creeds. But let any one look at the passage attentively and candidly; and what will he see to be its manifest purpose? Is it not to argue against the narrow dogmatism of the Unitarians, whose favorite topic is the incompatibility of the Divine Trinity with the Divine Unity? Every one who has the slightest knowledge of the history of Theology, must be aware how heresy after heresy has rung the changes on this argument: and Dr Hampden's object is plainly to maintain, that the Unity of God, as declared in the revelation to Moses, was not designed to be understood in that abstract speculative sense, in which it would have been contradictory to the subsequent revelation of the Trinity. It is a gross misconception of this passage, to fancy that it means to impugn, either the Unity of the Divine Being, or the Trinity, which, on the contrary, it expressly asserts.

Here we may perhaps discover the true view of that relation between the Bampton Lectures and Blanco White, out of which such a fable has been spun. As it is known from the Life of the latter, that he was greatly disturbed by doubts on this very point, for some time previous to the year when the Bampton Lectures were preacht, may we not plausibly conjecture that Dr Hampden, who is said to have been so intimate with him at the time, may have had him directly in his thoughts, when he wrote this passage? Is it not probable that the declaration of the Unity of God in the Old Testament may have been brought forward by Blanco White in conversation as an argument against the Trinity, and that this passage may have been intended as a reply to it, under the persuasion that other minds might have been disturbed thereby? One has only to look into Blanco White's Correspondence, to see how

this topic was brought forward, as altogether conclusive and unanswerable, by persons of all classes. Surely too it is honorable to Dr Hampden, if, while others were shunning their old friend, he endeavoured to convince him of his error. Perhaps also this will supply us with the true explanation of that perplexing passage in the *Observations on Dissent*, where the author speaks of putting a Unitarian on the same footing precisely of earnest religious zeal and love for the Lord Jesus Christ, on which he would place any other Christian. It may have been his regard for his friend, which led to the exaggerated expressions in this passage. We know too that Blanco White was truly animated by an earnest religious zeal, and by a fervent love for Christ, at the very time when his dogmatical speculations were leading him to doubt His Unity with the Father.

At all events these very words of the Law had already presented themselves to the Author's mind as a subject of consideration, in connexion with the doctrine of the Trinity, when he was writing his *Essay on the Evidence of Christianity*: see pp. 118, 158. In the latter of these two passages, he says: "If we consider in what manner we arrive at the Scriptural truth of a Trinity in the Unity of the Godhead,—we shall find that this doctrine is not dogmatically revealed to us in any express sentence, setting it forth to our belief in so many formal terms; but results rather, as a real truth of Revelation, from the concurrent evidence of a variety of passages, in which the Deity is represented as performing offices for the good of man under three *distinct* hypostases or persons. A doctrine established on a footing of this nature, it is important to observe, rests on the most immovable basis. For a single passage, or even several detached passages, expressly asserting any particular doctrine, may be interpolated, may be

caviled at, may be explained away : but a truth, to the establishment of which the whole tenour of a volume conspires, cannot be overthrown, without the destruction of the sense of the whole volume." Verily, in the whole disgraceful history of religious persecutions, there is scarcely an instance of a charge maintained so pertinaciously, without the slightest real ground, and in defiance of abundant evidence to the contrary, as this against Dr Hampden for denying the true doctrine of the Trinity.

With regard to the third Proposition, which I thought I had sufficiently vindicated in p. 35, by quoting the context, Mr Trower says, he "does not see how this improves Dr Hampden's case. The devout tone, in which Augustin refers to the mysterious truths express by the words *Generatio* and *Processio*, is strikingly contrasted with the spirit in which Dr Hampden sneers at *theories coucht under a logical phraseology*, and *our technical language* ; and (especially after what he has said about the oneness of the Deity) would any one receive the expression, *I believe that Word which has declared the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost*, as if it were equivalent to the Catholic confession, *The Father is God, the Son God, and the Holy Ghost God ; and yet there are not three Gods but one God*. God forbid that I should impute to Dr Hampden personally any error which he solemnly disclaims : but the above declaration of faith might be made by persons holding the greatest heresies." What can Mr Trower mean by deprecating the being guilty of such an imputation, when the purpose of the whole passage is to do the very thing which he deprecates ? to impute to Dr Hampden the very error which he has solemnly disclaimed ? Else, what is the import of Mr Trower's words ? When he called on God to forbid his doing so, he should forthwith have expunged the sentences, which directly

convey that imputation. Besides, since Dr Hampden quotes Augustin's words as expressive of his own belief, concluding his sermon with them, we should acknowledge that they do express it. As to the sneers, they exist nowhere, except in Mr Trower's imagination, to whom, from his habitual vagueness, the use of any precise terms seems to border on profaneness. That Dr Hampden's declaration of faith is not equivalent to the Catholic Confession, is quite true. But what reason had he for obtruding the latter in this place? A man who is conscious of being a firm believer, does not come forward in his sermon, and tell you that he is so. His very position in the pulpit implies it. Why then did he close his sermon with the above-cited declaration of faith? Because he had been speaking of the controversies concerning the generation of the Son and the procession of the Spirit; because he felt, with Augustin, that, though these words may be necessary as a bar to heretical speculation, they can only most dimly shadow forth the mysterious relations of the Divine Persons; and because he deemed that, it would have been better, had it been possible, for theology to confine itself to the simple Scriptural expressions, which tell us of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

Here I will insert another passage from the author's *Essay on the Evidence of Christianity* (p. 293), which may help to elucidate what has been so much misunderstood in the processes of his reasoning, and which at all events fully proves that the Bampton Lectures are the genuine work of the same mind. "The philosophy which the labourers in the field of human science pursue, is an investigation of ultimate principles. They endeavour, not only to trace connecting principles among the events of nature, but to simplify to the utmost the discerned connexions between physical events. But in Divine philosophy we must repress

this endeavour after simplification. We must be content to hold all the truths which are the subjects of it, as ultimate principles. For we know nothing of them beyond themselves, as a collection of attested facts, presented simultaneously to our contemplation. We have no knowledge of them as antecedents and consequences, as we have of the facts of Nature; and therefore, as our only mode of judging of the existence of necessary connexion fails us in regard to them, we have no reason to suppose that any one truth of Scripture is the grand antecedent of the rest, or the master-principle by which the whole congeries of Scripture truths may be combined. Indeed the absurdity of attempting so to combine them is demonstrated by the erroneous views of Christian doctrine, to which every such attempt invariably leads. For instance, if we assume the Divine predestination, as the great principle of our theological system, we expose ourselves to the absurdity of denying that God has bestowed the gift of a perfect free-will on man; and we destroy the moral force of God's promises set forth in Scripture, and the efficacy of prayer; and in short we disparage the whole revelation of Christianity by subordinating it to an abstruse metaphysical tenet. If we assume the Divine benevolence as our principle, we perplex ourselves with difficulties concerning the punishments actually inflicted on men in this world, or threatened in Scripture. If again we assume the sanctifying grace of the Holy Spirit, as the principle, we impugn that law of Providence, which assigns reward and punishment to every man according to his works, and weaken the ascription of our salvation to the atoning efficacy of the Redeemer's blood. If lastly we assume as our ultimate principle, to which every other doctrine must bend, the doctrine of justification by the merits of Christ, we incur the danger of Antinomianism, and we impair, in our exclusive zeal

for the honour of God the Son, the integrity of the doctrine of the Trinity, overlooking the equal importance of the relations which we bear also to God the Father, and God the Holy Ghost. These instances may well convince us that, however to superior intelligences the aggregate of religious doctrines may appear true, from their agreement with some one ultimate principle equally pervading them all, we can only know them as individual Facts, connected with each other in one scheme, or as instances, for the most part, of different principles of Divine Providence, which it belongs not to us to reconcile with each other, whilst they must be held by us in perfect concord.—The Articles of the Church of England not consisting so much of affirmations of Scripture truth, as of negations of doctrines unscripturally introduced into the body of the Faith, it is evident that their whole drift is to maintain the exclusive authority of Scripture, and not to limit it by selection. Upon the same principle of excluding heretical opinions as they arose, may be accounted for the greater length of the two later Creeds, compared with that called the Apostles Creed. And though, in the Athanasian, it is said concerning the believer, that ‘before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic faith,’ which faith it explains to consist in a right notion of the Trinity, we ought not to suppose that it states one doctrine as necessary above all others, but that the doctrine of a Trinity in Unity, when disencumbered of its unscriptural additions, as including all others, or as a comprehensive expression of all Scripture truth, is necessarily confest in the true confession of Christianity.” This passage, as I have before stated, was publisht in 1827, and proves how truly the author said in his Inaugural Lecture that he had made the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity the groundwork of his teaching throughout. It also refutes the calumny in the

last number of *the Christian Remembrancer*, where a writer charges Dr Hampden with “ attempting, in the Preface to the second edition of the Lectures, to evade the force of his own words, and explain the word *fact* in such a manner as, by including doctrines, to nullify and stultify the whole discussion of the Bampton Lectures at a blow. We will not characterize (he adds) the candour and honesty of such a proceeding.” Its candour and honesty however are thoroughly established by the use of the word *facts* in this passage printed five years before, and by other similar expressions in the same volume. The candour and honesty of the accusation, it may be less easy to vindicate.

After what has been said, I need not stop to reply to Mr Trower’s remarks on the sixth Proposition, which he acknowledges to be untrue, but does not think an unfair representation of the animus of the whole passage. The word is a characteristic one. The meaning of a sentence is what the author puts into it; the *animus*, whatever the reader’s jealous suspicions may like to detect.

In speaking of the seventh Proposition he expresses his “ deep regret that a person in my station ” should call Dr Hampden’s remark about the origin of the term, of ‘ *one substance with the Father*, ’ “ innocent enough.” Yet, as the remark merely states an etymological fact, I still cannot see what there is to blame in it. “ The language of the Nicene Creed (Mr Trower says,) was settled by the blessing of Almighty God on the Councils of his Church.” Still the Fathers who assembled at Nicea, had been educated in the philosophy of their age, and spoke its language. They were not charged with the invention of a new system of philosophy, still less of a new language. If their language was defective, it was the only instrument they had for expressing the truth; and so they made use of it.

Of the Propositions relating to the Atonement, Mr

Trower admits that one "is not fairly made;" but he tries to apologize for them all, as not materially misrepresenting the author's meaning. He further gives us his own view of the mystery of the Atonement, and thinks that Dr Hampden, in the passage quoted in pp. 46, 47, which he rebukes me for calling excellent, has represented the adaptation of this mysterious act to the wants of human nature as "the real end of this stupendous fact." Here however he again shews his inability to go along with the processes of reasoning pursued in the Bampton Lectures. According to the whole tenour of his theology, the Author entirely refrains from pronouncing what is the real end of the Atonement, when considered in its Divine relations. This is just what a disciple of Butler would do, and coincides with what Butler himself says in *the Analogy* on the subject (P. II. c. v.). "How and in what particular way the sacrifice of Christ had this efficacy, there are not wanting persons who have endeavoured to explain: but I do not find that the Scripture has explained it. We seem to be very much in the dark concerning the manner in which the ancients understood atonement to be made, *i. e.* pardon to be obtained by sacrifices. And if the Scripture has, as surely it has, left this matter of the satisfaction of Christ mysterious, left somewhat in it unrevealed, all conjectures about it must be, if not evidently absurd, yet at least uncertain.—Not only the reason of the thing, but the whole analogy of nature, teaches us not to expect to have the like information concerning the Divine conduct, as concerning our own duty.—The doctrine of a Mediator between God and man, against which it is objected, that the expediency of some things in it is not understood, relates only to what was done on God's part in the appointment, and on the Mediator's in the execution of it. For what is required of us, in consequence of this gracious dispensation,

is another subject, in which none can complain for want of information." Every attentive reader, I think, must perceive how closely these views coincide with Dr Hampden's, which in fact are avowedly derived from Butler, both on this and on other great theological questions. At the same time, like a disciple of Butler, he shews how the universal voice of human nature proclaims the need of some such Divine act; and this act, which fulfills all our needs in a manner far beyond our utmost conception and comprehension, he says, we find in the Atonement; adding that the purpose for which this act has been declared to us, is not, that we should enter into speculations, as theologians have been so fond of doing, concerning the relation of the Divine attributes to each other, but that, according to the teaching of St Paul, we may know that we have past from the death of sin to the life of righteousness, through Him who is our Atonement. Against speculations concerning the Divine act, contemplated in itself, he cannot, consistently with the whole bent of his theology, do otherwise than warn us. Nor is the warning needless. For monstrous and blasphemous errors have sprung out of such speculations, when rashly pursued by persons picking out a few texts, and building systems upon them, from the time of Marcion downward: and we need the utmost caution, lest, in speaking of the manner in which we conceive the purpose of God to have been changed, and His wrath to have been appeased, by the sacrifice of Christ, we lose sight, as so many have done, of those still more express and explicit declarations of Scripture, that with *the Father there is no variableness or shadow of turning*; and that *God so loved the world, that He gave His Only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life*; that *God commendeth His love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died*

for us; that in this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent His Onlybegotten Son into the world, that we might live through Him; that herein is Love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son to be the Propitiation for our sins. How continually are these latter most blessed truths veiled from our view in sermons on the Passion, in which the sacrifice of the Saviour is often represented as exclusively the act of the Son, offered up to satisfy the Justice of the Father, which must otherwise have condemned all mankind to eternal perdition! Yet such a representation, if we take the whole sum of the declarations in the Bible, is altogether unscriptural. But it enables us to set forth the Divine truth in the form of propositions deduced from certain human analogies, which are more easily comprehensible to the understanding, and more gratifying to its pride, than when the truth is left in that mysterious, ineffable glory, which surrounds it in its emanation from the bosom of the Godhead.

For the tenth extract, which I have called “perfidious,” and which, I had thought, must have shockt every one on seeing how it perverted the Author’s meaning, Mr Trower tries to stand up. He says that what Dr Hampden terms the philosophy of expiation, “includes that view of our blessed Saviour’s sacrifice, which led the framers of our Articles to speak of it thus: The offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone.” He further argues that Dr Hampden intends to imply that we ought “to qualify the plain meaning of that Article by reminding ourselves that the word *satisfaction* was used in the subtile reasonings and speculations of the schools, and that, as applied to our Saviour’s sacrifice,

it belongs to a philosophy of expiation, which he is not afraid to speak of as baneful." Now at all events, if Dr Hampden did mean to say anything like this, I know not by what magical process such a meaning can be extracted from the words of the Proposition,—“The bane of this philosophy of expiation was that it deprest the power of man too low.” Mr Trower’s transmuting glance may find that meaning in these words: I cannot. It is true, what Dr Hampden calls *the philosophy of expiation*, embraces a special view of the sacrifice of Christ: but what he means by it is that systematic representation of the relation between God and man, founded on the notions of commutative justice, which was worked out in the practice of the Church of Rome, and in the theological treatises of the Schoolmen, into such elaborate details; wherein the one sole Sacrifice for sin was almost lost sight of, amid the numberless ritual forms and human acts of satisfaction and penance and mortification. *The philosophy of expiation* is, not the view of the Divine act by itself, but the mischievous, deadly system constructed upon it. This is plain and unquestionable from the words which follow, and which I have quoted in p. 50. The bane of this philosophy of expiation, the author says, was, not that it exalted human agency too highly,—as might have been supposed from its ascribing the power of working out his own salvation by means of such acts to man;—but that, on the contrary, it deprest the power of man too low, that “it did not carry him at once to the Throne of Grace,” but degraded him into a servile dependence on the ministrations of the priest. Thus the purpose of the passage is to assert the very truth proclaimed in our thirty-first Article, which Mr Trower supposes it to impugn, that “the offering of Christ once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world both original

and actual ; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone."

The last passage from the Bampton Lectures, which Mr Trower quotes and condemns, is a long one concerning the Sacraments. Of this I said before (p. 51), and I repeat now with the fullest deliberation and confidence, that it treats of the medieval doctrine. Mr Trower indeed asks (p. 53), "How can Archdeacon Hare say that this is the medieval doctrine, when Dr Hampden has just before referred to the Catechism of the Church of England as retaining the fundamental idea of the scholastic doctrine?" In reply I would ask Mr Trower, or any other man with a single grain of intelligence, How he can read the seventh Lecture, without seeing that, from beginning to end, it treats of the Scholastic doctrine ; referring indeed here and there, on the one hand, to the Scriptural truths which that doctrine laid hold of and developd, and to the Scriptural expressions in which it sought support ; and, on the other hand, to the traces of that doctrine still retained in our technical phraseology. He might just as rationally assert that Niebuhr, or Arnold, did not write a history of Rome, because there are many allusions in their works to events and institutions belonging to the history of modern Europe. If he had lookt at the foot of the page, he would have seen that, what the Author meant by "the fundamental idea of the Scholastic doctrine," was that exprest in the definition of a sacrament, which we have retained, as *invisibilis gratiae visibile signum* ; words which admit, but do not necessitate, a material interpretation, and which, the author adds, "our Church has modified and improved in her subsequent application of the definition," thereby limiting its ambiguity and determining it in a spiritual sense.

In fact this is the object of the Bampton Lectures,

throughout, as the Author expressly states at the outset, and in the original Preface. Yet his adversaries, either from reading the book cursorily, for the purpose of finding stumbling-blocks in it, or from an incapacity for discerning minute scholastic distinctions, and following speculative trains of thought, have been unable or unwilling to apprehend this: and this is the main ground of their misconceptions. That a work of the kind should be thus misunderstood, when both philosophy and theology were at such a miserably low ebb, as they have been during the last generations in England, and when the theological education of our Clergy has been next to nothing, is not much to be wondered at; more especially as the writer himself has not cultivated that clearness and distinctness of language, which under such circumstances were especially needful. But that his objections do not touch the real efficacy of the Sacraments, as recognised by our Church, that they merely refer to the systematic theory of their mode of operation, which was elaborated into such minute details by the Schoolmen, and which became one of the most effectual instruments whereby the Church of Rome maintained her usurpations, and held the spirit of man in servile subjection, is evident, even from parts of the passage which Mr Trower transcribes. “Theologians (Dr Hampden there says) have not been content to rest on the simple fact of the Divine Ordinance, appointing certain external rites as essential parts of Divine service on the part of man, available to the blessing of the receiver. But they have treated the Sacraments *as effusions of the virtue of Christ, physically quickening and strengthening the soul*, in a manner analogous to the invigoration of the body by salutary medicines.” The last expressions Mr Trower considers at variance with that passage in our Catechism, where our souls are said to be “strengthened and refresht by the body and

blood of Christ, as our bodies are by the bread and wine." This is an example of the confusion, through which the readers of the Bampton Lectures have so often been led to suspect evil, where there was none. The expressions in our Catechism are indeed derived from that theoretical view, the erroneousness of which Dr Hampden endeavours to expose. But in our Catechism these expressions are merely intended as a figurative illustration of a spiritual act. In the theological systems, which he is combating, these expressions, like so many others of the same kind, which are used in Scripture as mere human illustrations of Divine mysteries,—κατ' ἄνθρωπον, as St Paul says,—from the necessities of human thought and speech, were treated as physical or logical explanations of those mysteries, and were woven into a speculative theory, to which neither the writers of Scripture, nor the framers of our symbolical books had any intentional reference. The error was the very same as that of which, in its application to Physical Science, Dr Whewell gives such a clear exposition in the section on the Aristotelian Physics in his *History of the Inductive Sciences*. Now, to recur to an instance already cited, a person who pointed out that the words, *jovial*, *mercurial*, *saturnine*, are derived from the astrology of the middle ages, would not intend thereby to tax those who may use these words with holding the errors of judicial astrology; nor is any censure of the kind implied, when it is remarked that certain theological terms have originated in erroneous philosophical views. Even words may lose the evil taint of their birth; and Horne Tooke's perverse notion, that the derivative senses of abstract terms must always be identified with their etymological meaning, has hardly found a follower. Some signs indeed are types; but in the great body of our current language the typical stamp is wholly worn away. If we keep these distinctions

in mind, we shall see that Dr Hampden throughout does not mean to controvert, but to assert and vindicate the Scriptural doctrine of the Sacraments, as held by our Church; and accordingly he closes his seventh Lecture by appropriating the beautiful words of Hooker. "He who has said of the one Sacrament, *Wash and be clean*, hath said concerning the other, *Eat and live*. If therefore, without any such particular and solemn warrant as this is, that poor distressed woman, coming to Christ for health, could so constantly resolve herself; *May I but touch the skirt of His garment, I shall be whole*; what moveth us to argue of the manner how life should come by bread? our duty being here, but to take what is offered, and most assuredly to rest persuaded of this, that, can we but eat, we are safe. What these elements are in themselves, it skilleth not: it is enough that, to me who take them, they are the body and blood of Christ. His promise in witness thereof sufficeth: His word He knoweth which way to accomplish. Why should any cogitation possess the mind of a faithful communicant, but this, *O my God, thou art true! O my soul, thou art happy!*"

In this and other speculations Dr Hampden may be mistaken. His views on divers philosophical, or even theological questions, may be erroneous. Let not Mr Trower catch at this as an "admission" that they are so: I am merely speaking hypothetically. Granting however that they are, is this to exclude him from the Episcopate? Clearly not; unless the errors are plainly contrary to the faith in Christ, as specifically defined by the Articles of our Church, for the direction of her Ministers. Surely we do not demand that every Bishop who is placed on the Bench should be infallible; nay, that he should never have committed an error in the whole course of his theological enquiries. Even conceding, what I merely

concede for the sake of argument, that there is grave theological error in the Bampton Lectures, where can we find a divine in whom there is none such? a divine who has not brought forward some particular portions of the Truth, to the omission or disparagement of others? May we not find grave errors, either positive, or no less important ones, from defective statements of the Truth, in Butler, in Bull, in Jeremy Taylor, in Hammond, in Andrewes, even in Leighton and Hooker,—in all the divines, as Mr Trower will probably be very ready to allow, of the foreign Protestant Churches,—in all the Romish divines,—in all those of the middle ages,—in all the Fathers,—in Chrysostom, in Basil, in the Gregories, in Jerome, even in Augustin. But what does this amount to? except to what even the heathens acknowledged, that *humanum est errare*, and what Christians assuredly have never been taught to deny; in other words, that no perfect declaration of the Truth is to be found anywhere except in the inspired word of God. Not that this confession should lessen our love and admiration for the great teachers of the Church, save by keeping it from degenerating into idolatry. They themselves would have been the first to recognise, and even to magnify their infirmities; and in this very recognition lay the main source of their strength. They were, and are still, pillars of the Church, though no one pillar can support the whole roof. They were teachers of the Truth, though not of the whole Truth, and not without alloy. Still too we may learn from them, as thousands and thousands have already: only in reading them we are to remember St Paul's injunction, to *prove all things, and hold fast that which is good*. For we are not made to receive knowledge, as water is poured into a cup, but to assimilate it, as a plant does its elemental food, separating and digesting.

that which is nourishing, and rejecting what is otherwise. Hence, as no one is mad enough to dream that we can have an infallible bench of Bishops, we have no right to demand an immunity from error in any new candidate for the Episcopate. Nor have we any right to narrow the bounds of theological speculation within the limits already prescribed to it by the laws of our Church. A Council of our Church might have such a legal right; but woe worth the day when a Council attempted to exercise it! At all events, until that day comes, let us freely and thankfully enjoy and use the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free. It is ours; and we are bound in duty to maintain it, and to suffer no man to curtail it.

In concluding his Remarks, Mr Trower says: "I fear that, instead of clearing Dr Hampden from the charge of heretical teaching, the Archdeacon will only strengthen the misgiving which exists among many as to the soundness of his own opinions, and the safety of his guidance in Theology." Of course, when I took up my pen, I had counted the cost, and well knew that the railers, who had nothing else to say, and would be enraged that a victim should be wrested from their grasp, would give vent to their rage by trying to fix their claws in another. I knew what an offense it is in the eyes of the Inquisition, and of all who are animated by its spirit, to urge anything in excuse of those whom they are about to consign to the stake. But I did not expect to find an amiable and good man, like Mr Trower, coming forward as their spokesman. "The time (he says) is come when men's real principles are tried:" and so it is. All times indeed are times of trial to our frail nature; but some may be so more especially, at least in certain respects. And this is a time when it is tried, whether men will cleave to truth and justice, unflinchingly, unswervingly, with singleness of

heart, at whatsoever cost, or whether they will surrender themselves to be the slaves and creatures and blind tools of a party. It is a time when we are to be tried, whether we will strive with unsleeping watchfulness against the prejudices of our understandings and the delusive predilections of our hearts, whether we can be candid in spite of ourselves, and can give impartial judgement in behalf of our enemies, whether we will eschew and abhor all manner of falsehood, or admit it into our arms, and let it suck our heart's blood, and poison all our affections. Doubtless a disputant might rejoin, that a misgiving exists as to the soundness of Mr Trower's own opinions. For who is there in these days, earnestly holding any determinate opinions of whatsoever kind, whose soundness is not distrusted by one party or another? Misgivings, suspicions, jealousies, backbitings, cavils, quarrels, calumnies have almost become the ordinary diet of our Church. I regret that a person like Mr Trower should have allowed himself to throw out such an insinuation, that he should not have felt the sinfulness of doing so. Having just been urging that no divine, not even the greatest, is exempt from error, I ought to be the last person to claim such an exemption for myself. I have desired indeed, and endeavoured, that my writings should be free from errors; but doubtless there are many in them, some, it may be, indicating unsoundness of doctrine. As I have spoken too with condemnation of the errors of others, when it has seemed to me requisite for the wellbeing of the Church that fallacies, by which some might be misled, should be exposed and reproved, I cannot expect that my own should pass unreprieved. Still less do I desire it. Let Mr Trower bring them forward definitely and distinctly; let him condemn them as severely as they may deserve;

and if he convinces me of their erroneousness, he shall rank thenceforward among my chief benefactors. For surely a minister of Christ ought not to be less sincere in his love for truth, than the heathen philosopher, who says so beautifully in the *Gorgias*, that he is one τῶν ἡδέως μὲν ἂν ἐλεγχθέντων, εἴ τι μὴ ἀληθὲς λέγω, ἡδέως δ' ἂν ἐλεγχάντων, εἴ τίς τι μὴ ἀληθὲς λέγοι, οὐκ ἀηδέστερον μέν τ' ἂν ἐλεγχθέντων ἢ ἐλεγχάντων· μείζον γὰρ αὐτὸ ἀγαθὸν ἡγοῦμαι, ὅσω περ μείζον ἀγαθὸν ἐστὶν αὐτὸν ἀπαλλαγήναι κακοῦ τοῦ μεγίστου ἢ ἄλλον ἀπαλλάξαι. οὐδὲν γὰρ οἶμαι τοσοῦτον κακὸν εἶναι ἀνθρώπῳ, ὅσον δόξα ψευδῆς περὶ ὧν τυγχάνει νῦν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος ὢν. At the same time I would exhort Mr Trower, if he desires not to be found wanting in this time of trial, to refrain most sedulously from everything like a vague, indefinite insinuation against a brother. It is like inflicting a wound in the dark, or behind one's back, when one cannot meet or parry it. Against a definite charge one may defend oneself; or, if it be wellgrounded, it may be a help to self-knowledge and correction. But an insinuation is purely mischievous, to him against whom it is brought, to all who allow their confidence in a brother to be disturbed by it, and above all to him who brings it. As to being an unsafe guide, I desire not to be a guide to any one, beyond those who are especially committed to my charge, except by helping him to guide himself, by helping him, if I may, to love the truth, and to seek it for himself, through a diligent and faithful exercise of the faculties with which God has supplied him, and at the sources which God has opened to him. When one wishes to deliver others from servile submission to any earthly authority, it would be a flagrant inconsistency to set up oneself as a guide. If St Paul said, *Who is Paul? and who is Apollos?* what does it behove

us to say, but that we are nothing, except instruments in God's hands, whom He employs in the work of His Gospel, according as it seems good to Him?

In a Postscript to his Remarks, Mr Trower finds fault with the Bishop of Oxford for withdrawing the suit against Dr Hampden in the Court of Arches. On this question I am not called to enter. But since Mr Trower (in p. 64), "begs my especial attention" to certain distinctions, which he taxes his ingenuity to establish between the Bishop of Oxford's sentence and mine, I cannot conclude without observing that, in spite of these distinctions, his judgement is essentially the same. To make out these discrepancies Mr Trower urges that, "notwithstanding my admissions, I have pronounced the completest, most honorable acquittal;" leaving out of sight, according to his wont, that, in saying this, I spoke (p. 60) "so far as regards the heresies imputed to Dr Hampden, and supposing that the Propositions are the strongest evidence that can be adduced." On the other hand it is true that the Bishop of Oxford lays a good deal of stress on certain concessions, which he conceives Dr Hampden to have made, which, however, if we sift them, we plainly see, amount to nothing. Sitting in some measure as a judge on the question, he expresses himself judicially, with divers limitations. Still he declares the Bampton Lectures to be pretty nearly what I have throughout described them, "a thoughtful and able history of the formation of dogmatic terminology, not a studied depreciation of authorized dogmatic language, still less any conscious denial of admitted dogmatic truth." If he complains of an overstatement of favorite views, I had used nearly the same words. If he ascribes the misjudgement of the work to "obscurity of diction," and similar defects, it is to be remembered that he had to apologize, not only for his own misjudgement, under the influence of which he

had so long acted, but for that of many of his friends ; while, as I had not been mixt up in the previous controversy, I had nothing to retract, and perhaps, from a longer familiarity with the obscurities of language and the tangled reasonings, which are so common in philosophical and theological treatises, was not equally disturbed by them. A reader of Nitzsch and Daub, of Kant and Hegel, will not be so easily offended by the obscurities of Dr Hampden, but will try to pierce through them for the sake of getting to his real meaning.

Here at length I may take leave of Mr Trower. To some readers it may seem that I have spent far too many words on a Pamphlet, which, unless I have grossly misrepresented it, cannot be of much real weight. But, as a drowning man will catch at a straw, so there are some among Dr Hampden's adversaries, who, seeing their cause slipping away from under their feet, will even catch at such arguments as those here adduced. In the present state of feeling too, if any objections are left unnoticed as undeserving of a serious refutation, it is assumed that they are admitted, as I have already experienced in this case. For, after having exposed the fallaciousness of four or five-and-thirty out of the forty-two Propositions, I past over the remainder, partly from weariness at the painful task, and partly from thinking that every intelligent reader would perceive how the explanations of the other passages objected to would apply to the rest. Nevertheless some persons have thought fit to ensconce themselves behind these. This, though I have not thought it necessary to return and dislodge them, has rendered me fuller and more minute than I should else have been in replying to Mr Trower. Nor shall I deem my words wasted, if they can avail to clear up any doubts in a single mind among the thousands that have been disturbed by this

calamitous agitation. The enemy, we have already seen, is on the alert, and will try, secretly and openly, to take advantage of this occasion for drawing weak and wavering minds from their allegiance to our Church. This from the first was one of my chief reasons for deploring Dr Hampden's appointment. The Minister tells us that his intention was to strengthen the Protestant cause in our Church; but I am afraid, hardly any measure he could have adopted, would have tended so greatly to strengthen our opponents. Our endeavours ought to be to confirm the waverers, those who are weak in the faith, and not to involve them in doubtful disputations: but the effect of this appointment is to repel them, and to entangle them in manifold perplexities. With a view to such persons more especially have I written in this Postscript, from a strong desire to help, if I may, in dispelling the delusions by which so many minds have been irritated and troubled, and to convince them that our beloved Church is not undergoing the oppression and disgrace, as her enemies are ready to cry out, of having a heretical Bishop forced upon her by an arbitrary exercise of the civil supremacy, but that the new Bishop has been greatly misrepresented and calumniated, and holds, and, so far as we have means of judging, has ever held and taught the true Christian faith, as defined by the Creeds and Articles of our Church.

On the many difficult and distressing ecclesiastical questions which have arisen out of this controversy, I abstain from speaking. It would require far more knowledge than I possess, to speak on them to any purpose. Let us wait quietly for the decision of the Law. Should that be injurious to the Church, let us seek to have the law amended in a constitutional manner. Our strength, now as ever, lies in patience, not in clamour or turbulence. Let us stand at our post, and not quit it. Let us close our ears

against all allurements to desert it. Let us look with confidence to God, and also with confidence, not with jealous suspicions, to those whom He has set over us. Even as a matter of policy, confidence is strength, and will conciliate the powers that be, while jealousy and suspicion must needs alienate them. And the Epistle for the week teaches us how that which is the course of policy, is also the course of duty.

February 2d, 1848.

Since writing the above, I have seen *the Christian Observer* for the month of January ; and, having stated that almost every one I know of who has taken the pains to examine Dr Hampden's writings fairly and attentively, has been led to form a favorable judgement on the question of his orthodoxy, I feel bound to mention that the writer of the remarks upon him in that Journal, though evidently desirous to do him justice, and reluctant to condemn him, "regrets" that he cannot pronounce the charges of heterodoxy groundless. I would fain hope that the impartial writer of those observations, should he read the foregoing explanations of Dr Hampden's opinions, will find many of his objections removed : and if he will look over the last two chapters of *the Analogy*, he will see that several of the views which have been deemed so offensive in the Bampton Lectures, are merely expansions of what had been said long ago by Butler. Thus, in the seventh chapter, in a passage which Dr Hampden, in a note to his *Inaugural Lecture*, says first suggested to him the use of the term *fact*, Butler writes : "This Revelation, whether real or supposed, may be considered as wholly historical. For prophecy is nothing but the history of events before they come to pass : *doctrines also are matters of fact* : and precepts come under the same notion. And the general design of Scripture, which contains in it this Revelation, thus considered as historical, may be said to be to give us an account of the world, in this one

single view, as God's world." These words seem to contain the origin of the passage in the *Observations on Dissent*, quoted above (pp. 41, 42), and which the Christian Observer also quotes and finds fault with. Again, in the eighth chapter, Butler says : " Now, these two abstract principles of liberty and moral fitness being omitted, *religion can be considered in no other view than merely as a question of fact* ; and in this view it is here considered. It is obvious that Christianity, and the proof of it, are both historical. And even *Natural Religion is properly a matter of fact. For that there is a righteous Governor of the world, is so.* —So likewise, that there is, in the nature of things, an original standard of right and wrong in actions, independent upon all will, but which unalterably determines the will of God to exercise that moral government over the world which religion teaches, *i. e.* finally and upon the whole to reward and punish men respectively as they act right or wrong,—*this assertion contains an abstract truth, as well as matter of fact.* But suppose in the present state every man was rewarded and punished in exact proportion as he followed or transgressed that sense of right and wrong which God has implanted in the nature of every man, *this would not be at all an abstract truth, but only a matter of fact.*—And thus God having given mankind a moral faculty, the object of which is actions, and which naturally approves some actions as right and condemns others as wrong, that He will finally, and upon the whole, reward the former and punish the latter, *is not an assertion of an abstract truth, but of what is as mere a fact as His doing so at present would be.*" If the Christian Observer will weigh these passages, along with what has been said above in pp. 13—15, he must, I think, see the injustice of charging Dr Hampden with "*slipping in the Consubstantiality of the Son with the Father and the Holy Spirit among his revealed facts,*" as though he had done this dishonestly. The words which I have quoted in p. 14, from the Bampton Lectures, prove that this must already have been in the Author's mind ; and according to his phraseology our Lord's declaration, *I and the Father are one*, is the declaration of a Divine Fact. As controversy leads one to bring out the controverted points more distinctly, even before one's own mind, the Author's conception of the term *Fact* became more definite when

he wrote his Introduction to the second edition : but this does not warrant a charge of inconsistency, still less of the moral obliquity imputed to him by *the Christian Remembrancer*, even though he may be found to have used the word at times in a sense answering to its ordinary acceptation. This is a danger to which an innovator in the use of words must needs be liable.

With regard to the validity of consequences drawn by way of inference from truths explicitly declared in Scripture, which validity Dr Hampden is supposed by most of his opponents altogether to deny, I would request the attention of the Christian Observer to the sixth Section of the above-mentioned Introduction, where this question is ably discuss'd ; for instance, to the following words : " It would be perfectly illogical and absurd for any one to deny consequences rightly drawn from admitted premises. If, for instance, Scripture shews, as it does, that our Saviour is truly God, as well as truly Man, the consequence is irrefragable that He united Two Natures in One Person.—A consequence of this kind is nothing more than what has been already affirmed in Scripture. We have done nothing more than collect or put together the affirmations of Scripture. Though we may not therefore read this conclusion *totidem verbis* in Scripture, it is as much in Scripture as if it had been read there *totidem verbis*. Whatever then can be thus argued from Scripture is as true as Scripture is true. In this way things spiritual are compared with spiritual ; and a consistent sense is drawn out by just reasoning on the comparison." This passage, with the rest of the Section, where the necessary restrictions to these logical processes are set forth, is a complete answer to the main part of the objections urged by the Christian Observer.

